

A History of The American Empire in Ten Chapters

By

John Yorks

Since before the founding of the republic, the United States has been an expansionist and imperialist enterprise. Founded as a settler society, on land belonging to others, the early imperialists focused on westward expansion – often at the peril of the indigenous peoples.

For the purposes of this book, however, let us accept the territorial integrity of the 48 contiguous states, Alaska, and Hawaii. Allowing for ambiguity, let us accept that this area belongs to the republic under federal style governance. Taking this for granted, the first attempt at extra-territorial conquest could be said to have begun in 1775 – before the signing of the Declaration of Independence. And it took the form of an invasion of Canada.

David Orchard, author of the book, *The Fight for Canada*, pointed out in an interview, "Very few English speaking Canadians are aware that Canada was the very first country in the world to be invaded by the new United States of America in 1775. Benjamin Franklin arrived in Montreal after the American troops occupied the city and declared that Canada was to be the '14th American colony.' He set up his printing press and told Canadians, 'you have been conquered into Liberty if you

act as you ought.”¹ According to another source, “When Benjamin Franklin arrived in Montreal in 1775 with the invading army of the Continental Congress, he carried secret orders to ban the popish religion and the French language.”² Years later, in the context of the War of 1812, Thomas Jefferson would remark, “The acquisition of Canada this year, as far as the neighborhood of Quebec, will be a mere matter of marching and will give us experience for the attack on Halifax next.”³ So, from before the Articles of Confederation or the Constitution – or even the Declaration of Independence, America has had territorial designs upon Canada.

Some might argue that the situation was not so simplistic, as not all Americans or Canadians were unified about the future of their respective countries. This is certainly true to a great extent, as there were Loyalists on the American side, and Canadians who sympathized with the American Revolution on the other. John Adams is famously credited with claiming about 1/3 of the American people supported the American Revolution, with the rest either not caring or being Loyalists. On the Canadian side, in Nova Scotia, there were some in the west of

¹ Orchard, David. “Canada, Nationalism, and Empire.” An interview with Justin Podur. <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=6866>.

² Caldwell, Gary. “How an Anglo-Irish Aristocrat Saved Quebec – And Why No one Knows About it.” *Inroads*. 2001. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4014/is_200101/ai_n8950835.

³ Orchard, David. *The Fight for Canada*. Robert Davies Multimedia Publishing. Westmount, QC; 2002. (pg. 22)

the province who supported the American Revolutionary cause. One even wrote an anonymous letter to George Washington asking to be liberated.⁴ Many others remained loyal to the crown.

The dominant section of the elite in the thirteen colonies however, those that planned and carried out the separation of the colonies from England, supported the incursion into Canada. It was seen as part of the war effort. Early on, Samuel Adams helped set up a committee that eventually sent a spy into Canada. The goal of the operation was to see how likely it would be to draw Canada into the opposition against the British. The spy reported back his belief that, "fear alone kept the Canadians and especially those of British extraction, from joining the other colonies in their opposition; and from Montreal he (the spy) sent urgent advice to his employers to take immediate measures to capture Ticonderoga."⁵ This led to an attempt to take Fort Ticonderoga, with Ethan Allen writing many years later of his heroism in his *Captivity Voyage*.⁶ The attempt was successful, and provided access to Lake Champlain and a base for the coming attack on Quebec. Allen would not be as successful in the campaign on

⁴ Reprinted in Bennet, Paul W. and Cornelius Jaenen. *Emerging Identities*. Prentice-Hall Canada Inc. Scarborough, Ontario; 1986. (pg. 147)

⁵ Lossing, Benson J. "Ethan Allen." *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* No. CII. November. 1858 - Vol. XVII <http://www.usgennet.org/usa/topic/revwar/NH/ethanallen.html>

⁶ An excellent audio CD version of which is available through the Ethan Allen Homestead Museum in Burlington, Vermont.

Quebec, as he would be captured and sent in chains to Britain as a prisoner. He would be returned much later through the efforts of the Americans who obtained his release. He recounts the entirety of his adventures, in a spellbinding way – in his account of his *Captivity Voyage*.

Incidentally, and perhaps ironically, after the war, Allen's colony of Vermont would remain an independent republic for a number of years. This was mainly because the new national government didn't want to wade into a dispute, which predated the war, between New York and Vermont over territory. There was also a period after the war in which Allen was accused of plotting to join Vermont with Canada. Vermont's standing was further complicated by prior claims upon it by New Hampshire, as a result of land grants that were given out by the government of New Hampshire early on.⁷

Ethan Allen believed that, by invading Canada, "instead of turning the Canadians and Indians against us, as is wrongly suggested by many, it would unavoidably attach and connect them to our interest."⁸ This is a refrain that would be heard often throughout the history of the

⁷ For a highly readable account of the early years of Vermont, see Jellison, Charles A. *Ethan Allen: Frontier Rebel*. Syracuse University Press. Syracuse, NY; 1969.

⁸ Lossing, Benson J. "Ethan Allen." *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* No. CII. November. 1858 - Vol. XVII <http://www.usgennet.org/usa/topic/revwar/NH/ethanallen.html>

American Empire, as anyone familiar with the history of America in Iraq during the second Gulf War would recognize. And, of course, as has proven the case again and again afterwards – Allen turned out to be wrong.

The Americans managed to capture Montreal, but were unable to capture Quebec City. As for popular opinion and where it stood, the Quebec Act had alleviated much of the tension felt by a large number of Quebecois, yet many were either neutral or sympathetic towards the Americans. As one expert states, "Some Canadiens supported the rebels, others, the British. The majority remained neutral. Canada's English-speaking merchants proved equally unwilling to commit to either side, and split into pro-British and pro-American factions."⁹ As the American forces marched on Quebec, their fortunes became increasingly grim, as did the possibility of capturing Canada as the "14th Colony."

Meanwhile, the Governor of Canada had managed to flee Montreal and slip into Quebec City to the dismay of the Americans. The mood fluctuated between capitulation to the American invaders and defiance

⁹ Macleod, D. Peter. "REVOLUTION REJECTED: CANADA AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION." (An introduction to an exhibit at the Canadian War Museum.) http://www.civilization.ca/cwm/expo/background_e.html

towards those invaders. By the time a letter from Benedict Arnold to General Montgomery was intercepted by a Canadian officer giving advance knowledge of the pair's attack plan, the mood swung toward defiance. Governor Guy Carleton ordered all men fit enough to serve in the defense to do so, or leave the walled city of Quebec. There would be no welcome for the invaders.

After suffering greatly due to the cold and difficult weather encountered during their march, Montgomery's men arrived in early December 1775 to bolster the force of Arnold, who had tramped through the Maine woods. It wasn't until the end of December that the Americans attempted to storm the city. The siege was repelled.

General Montgomery had insisted, "Till Quebec is taken, Canada is unconquered."¹⁰ Montgomery lost his life in the siege. Many were wounded or captured. Arnold himself was wounded, and for the moment, had to retreat.

The Americans tried throughout the spring of 1776 to capture Quebec City, and despite their superior numbers, were unable to do so. Eventually they were chased from Montreal, and in turn, Canada

¹⁰ Orchard, David. *The Fight for Canada*. Robert Davies Multimedia Publishing. Westmount, QC; 2002. (pg. 15)

remained in British and Canadian hands. By this time, it must have become clear that Canadians, be they French or English – were not interested in being Americans. However, the Empire’s capacity for self-delusion is infinite.

There would be another attempt at conquest led by a new generation in 1812. John Randolph, seasoned politician, complained of the young “War Hawks” coming into their own in Congress, “We have heard but one word – like the whip-poor-will, but one eternal monotonous tone – Canada! Canada! Canada!”¹¹ Yet again, there would be little interest in becoming American, and the invasion would be repelled – even though the Americans were the stronger party. Canadian writer and activist David Orchard claims, “Canada’s population was outnumbered by the Americans twenty-five to one. In terms of military force, the United States recruited more men during the war than the total population of Canada.”¹² However, the Canadians had a good relationship with Tecumseh, who was attempting to unite the heirs of the original inhabitants of North America to fight to secure their land. He was a strong ally for Canada. He didn’t survive the war. Also, as the war against Napoleon in Europe came to a conclusion, the British would be

¹¹ Tindall, George Brown with David E. Shi. *America: A Narrative History*. W.W. Norton and Company, Inc. NY; 1996. (pg. 382) (Also quoted in Orchard, *The Fight for Canada*.)* Apparently, the origin of this quote can be traced back to Henry Adams’s *A History of the US under the Jefferson and Madison Administrations*. Where Adams takes it from, I don’t know.

¹² Orchard, David. *The Fight for Canada*. (Pgs. 23-24)

able to focus more fully on the war in America. During the war, the British burned the White House. It had only been occupied for a full-term since the previous administration of Thomas Jefferson. In fairness, the pretext for this war was the true claim that Americans were being taken on the high seas and forced into the service of England to fight against the forces of Napoleon.

None-the-less, Canada would come under the sway of the US over time to an extent. The armed forces and defense industries of the two countries would become vastly integrated, with the US playing the dominant role. As the writer Gore Vidal put it, "Well, it is true that after two failed invasions, Canada escaped us; even so, we have a naval base on Canadian soil (at Argentia), and Canada plays its dutiful if irritable part in our imperium, economically as well as militarily."¹³

During the Vietnam War, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada would exclaim, "Canada should be a refuge from militarism."¹⁴ Whether that path is taken, or a path towards greater integration into an American Empire that is diminishing due to imperial overreach in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the July 2006 proxy war in Lebanon, is a matter for Canadians to decide.

¹³ Vidal, Gore. "Mickey Mouse, Historian." From *The Last Empire*. Doubleday. NY;2001.

¹⁴ Quoted on the War Resisters Support Campaign Canada. <http://www.resisters.ca/declaration.html>.

Around the turn of the last century, the United States did an astounding thing. While preaching freedom and democracy as concepts that our people hold in the highest esteem, America made territorial conquests of several Pacific and Caribbean islands. These islands included Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Philippines among others. Hawaii was also acquired during this period, but didn't gain statehood until much later. Cuba was spared direct conquest because of pressure from some senators who were against annexation of the island. However, the pretext for these conquests centered on an incident that took place off the coast of Cuba. The *Maine*, an American battleship, exploded while resting near Cuba. The Spanish, who were the colonial rulers of Cuba at the time, were blamed for this incident. The fighting and conquest that ensued has been named the "Spanish-American War."

This was not the first time that Cuba fell into the view of American politicians and businessmen, nor would it be the last. As Derrick O'keefe eloquently sums up, "The official attitude of the U.S. government towards Cuba was, in fact, explicitly laid out as far back

as 1823, when then Secretary of State John Quincy Adams described the Caribbean island as a 'ripe fruit' that would naturally fall under U.S. control once it was wrested from the Spanish Empire."¹⁵ Much later in history, removing Cuban leader Fidel Castro from power, if not from the world of the living, would become a goal bordering on obsession for the Kennedy brothers John and Robert. In fairness, it could be said most of the American political class shared the obsession, which continues to this day. Or, put more succinctly, "For upwards of forty-five years, the official policy of successive U.S. governments has been to strangle Cuba economically through a comprehensive embargo, or blockade, and to isolate the socialist island from its Latin American neighbors."¹⁶

The United States still holds several of these territories, often called "unincorporated territories" for reasons of their standing within the republic. Most of them were taken from Spanish control during the Spanish-American War, but at least one, the Virgin Islands was purchased around World War One. It was thought an important strategic area because of fear of German submarine incursions.

¹⁵ O'keefe, Derrick. "Ripe Fruit and Rotten Imperial Ambitions." From *Counterpunch* magazine online edition. <http://www.counterpunch.org/okeefe08042006.html>

¹⁶ Ibid.

Generally, these territories use American currency. For the most part, they do not have true representation in congress, but many send "non-voting" delegates to congress. Other than the use of American currency, there are a few commonalities between these territories – such as English as one of the main languages, and some provision for American constitutional law. Otherwise, there are certainly differences between the various territories. Some are more content to remain in their current situation, while others like Puerto Rico have had a measure of unrest over their relationship to the US. Puerto Rico, not so long ago, voted down a measure to become the 51st State.

The Sandwich Islands, now known as the state of Hawaii, were brought into the American empire through a combination of deceit and treachery. In fact, President Grover Cleveland himself said of the matter, ""Substantial wrong has thus been done which a due regard for our national character as well as the rights of the injured people requires we should endeavor to repair the monarchy."¹⁷ He was referring to the actions of American businessmen and politicians who had basically taken control of the Island from the Hawaiian queen. This was done in large part to satisfy Sanford Dole, whose family was

¹⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Hawaii#Overthrow_and_annexation.

involved in the pineapple business. Sanford later became President of the Hawaiian Republic.

Despite Grover Cleveland's initial reaction, the island remained effectively in American hands, and under McKinley, was annexed officially.

In the case of American Samoa, the United States acquired these islands through a treaty agreement with Germany in 1899. This was literally a case of imperial powers (European and American) dividing up colonial domains between German Western Samoa and American Samoa. The British, because of concerns for their own colonial interests, were involved in forming this agreement, as well. Over time, Western Samoa became independent, after first enduring occupation by New Zealand beginning at the time of World War One. It is now often simply referred to as Samoa. In fact, there was an independence movement in both Western Samoa and American Samoa. The American Samoan movement was hugely suppressed from the start, with the help of some of the same characters involved in the American effort to dominate Hawaii.¹⁸

¹⁸ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mau_movement. (Also, for general information see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Samoa.)

Guam, one of the Mariana Islands, was the first possession taken by the United States in the Pacific as a result of the Spanish-American War. The Northern Mariana Islands have commonwealth status, and are affiliated with the United States. Guam was pretty much defenseless, and was captured with little effort on the American side – partly because the Spanish governor of Guam was unaware war had been declared. However, the fortifications and the arms were very inadequate for the defense of Guam against a serious attempt by one of the colonial powers to take it. During World War Two, the Japanese conquered Guam and held it during the war. Generally, the residents of Guam were loyal to the Americans and their cause during the war. Much later, there would be unsuccessful attempts to establish a commonwealth. Guam is of prime military importance to the United States.¹⁹

Puerto Rico continues a history of uneasiness with the United States at the time of this writing. It too was taken as a result of the Spanish-American War with relative ease for the American forces. In recent years, one of Puerto Rico's islands, Vieques, has been used as a bombing range for target practice by the United States military. This action has been opposed by many Puerto Ricans, including a recent

¹⁹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capture_of_Guam. (For general information, see <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Guam>.)

governor of the commonwealth. In fact, the United States used depleted uranium bombs, believed by many to be at the root of increased cancers and other ill health effects in Iraq and elsewhere.²⁰

The most brutal fighting of this war took place in the Philippines. Oddly enough, the fact that the Philippines is practically on the other side of the world from Cuba didn't seem to impede the plans of those intent on making America an imperial power. In fact, this is often thought of as a separate war called the "Philippines War." As Gore Vidal outlines in his essay, "The Day the American Empire ran out of Gas," there were at least four planners of this new imperial focus. He names Teddy Roosevelt, Brooks Adams, Admiral Mahan, and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge as the "four horsemen" behind this particular venture. As Vidal rightly points out, "Although Philippine nationalists had been our allies against Spain, we promptly betrayed them and their leader, Emilio Aguinaldo. As a result, it took us several years to conquer the Philippines, and tens of thousands of Filipinos died that our empire might grow."²¹ Vidal also emphasizes the importance of the United States becoming a Pacific power to the thinking of these early imperialists.

²⁰ <http://www.dailyprincetonian.com/archives/2002/04/12/news/4890.shtml>. (For depleted uranium information see <http://www.vieques-island.com/navy/du.html>.)

²¹ Vidal, Gore. "The Day the American Empire Ran Out Of Gas." from *The Decline and Fall of the American Empire*. Odonian Press. Berkely, CA;1992. (pg. 17)

As Vidal also points out, there were many, including that most American of authors Mark Twain, who opposed these actions. Twain, was in fact, a member of something called the Anti-Imperialist League, which opposed the war in the Philippines. He spent many of his later years writing and speaking out against the worst excesses of American policy abroad. "And so I am an anti-imperialist," stated Twain. "I am opposed to having the eagle put its talons on any other land."²²

For a time, the Philippines were under occupation by US troops. The American President at the time, William McKinley, declared "Mission Accomplished" after the main rebel leader, Emilio Aguinaldo, was captured in 1901, but the insurgency continued for several years. The Moros, who were Muslim Filipinos mainly from the south, continued to fight a guerrilla war until 1913.

In fairness to McKinley, there were certainly others, Theodore Roosevelt among them, who had greater interest in promoting the taking of the Philippines. However, there is evidence suggesting many Filipinos saw McKinley as the main proponent of continuing the effort to subjugate them, as one strategy was the infliction of casualties

²² <http://www.historywiz.com/primarysources/marktwain-imperialism.htm>. From *Mark Twain's Weapons of Satire: Anti-Imperialist Writings on the Philippine-American War*, Jim Zwick, ed., (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1992).

upon the Americans as a way of influencing the American electorate that the war was not worth the price paid in blood. Their hope was that William Jennings Bryan, the anti-imperialist candidate, would win the election of 1900. He didn't, and this may have demoralized some Filipinos.²³ The island didn't gain full independence until 1946.

The war was fought with great cruelty, with massacres, concentration camps, and wanton destruction. For instance, Mark Twain wrote derisively of an incident in which at least 600 Moros were massacred by American forces. After reading a newspaper article in which an order was given to "kill or capture" the Moros, of which a number were apparently women and children, Twain describes how "Apparently our little army considered that the 'or' left them authorized to kill or capture according to taste, and that taste had remained what it had been for eight years, in our army out there – the taste of Christian butchers."²⁴

Americans often deny any accusation of being imperialist, and certainly deny holding an empire in the classical sense of the term. Yet, the United States continues to hold territories taken through war at the opening of the last century. The territories are home to peoples

²³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philippine-American_War.

²⁴ Twain, Mark. *On the Damned Human Race*. (Edited by Janet Smith) Hill and Wang. NY; 1962. (pg. 13)

who, as of this writing, have no full representation in American national government. One can play games of semantics. Yet, it seems clear that what the United States did around the turn of the last century clearly conforms to the accepted notions of the time about the creation of colonial empires.

Woodrow Wilson promised to keep the United States out of World War I. Then, he went back on his promise and went to war on the side of Britain and France against Germany and her allies. This was the issue of foreign policy most Americans were concerned with at the time. After all, it would affect many young American men directly because they would be called to fight that war.

Writing during the Great Depression, General Smedley Butler recalled his role as a "racketeer, a gangster for capitalism."²⁵ He was mainly referencing his time in Latin America and Asia, but within the small book, *War Is A Racket*, he applied the same logic to his analysis of World War I and the approaching World War II in Europe and Asia. He saw it as profit for the war industries and all the other ancillary industries that seemed to increase their wealth through forcing suffering upon those directly harmed by war. In fact, he thought the only way to end the cycle of war was to make sure the profiteers suffer too greatly as a consequence of war to continue starting wars.

²⁵ Butler, Smedley. <http://www.fas.org/man/smedley.htm> (Excerpt of a speech given in 1933.) *Many think it is in the text of *War Is A Racket*, but I have not been able to locate it there.

He had a proposal to limit the income of the “kings and tycoons and masters of business” as well as anyone else who might benefit from war to small monthly allowances “not to exceed that paid to the soldiers in the trenches!”²⁶

Around the same time, however, there was intervention involving military conflict directly south of the US border in Mexico. This involved America’s desire to interfere in the internal power struggle of the Mexican people. It also led to the only time the US has been invaded by non-governmental forces from Mexico in the form of a military attack.

Relations between the United States and Mexico had not always been peaceful prior to this point. In fact, great expanses of territory were acquired from Mexico as a result of the Mexican American War. California and Texas are two states that had once been under the governance of Mexico. By 1913, however, Woodrow Wilson would promise that we “will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest.”²⁷ It is difficult to claim with certitude that the subsequent invasion by sea and occupation of Veracruz violated that promise outright, being that it was brought about by Wilson’s desire to

²⁶ Butler, Smedley. *War Is A Racket*. Ferial House. Los Angeles, CA; 2003. (ch. 4)

²⁷ Tindall, George Brown with David E. Shi. *America: A Narrative History*. W.W. Norton and Company, Inc. NY; 1996. (Pg. 1047)

help the Mexican faction he saw as the legitimate governing faction in Mexico. There was, as well, an incident involving American sailors being arrested in Tampico, Mexico. Yet, Smedley Butler would again differ with Wilson's interpretation of events. As Butler himself said, "I helped make Mexico, especially Tampico, safe for American oil interests in 1914."²⁸ Was oil the real reason for Wilson's intervention in Mexico? At any rate, by 1914 not only had the United States acquired parts of Mexico through force, it was now occupying a port city within recognized Mexican territory. So when Pancho Villa invaded Columbus, New Mexico, it could have been considered a belated attempt to liberate conquered territory. However, it is safe to say Woodrow Wilson, along with most Americans (and likely many Mexicans), didn't see it that way.

Astounding as it may seem to one living in the first decade of the 21st century, Pancho Villa did indeed lead a force of several hundred across the border to raid and burn sections of Columbus, New Mexico. Oddly enough, the State of New Mexico even maintains a park commemorating Villa's raid.²⁹ There were casualties on both sides, with the damage to the town being quite apparent. According to one source, "After the raid more than 60 Mexican bodies were found in

²⁸ Butler, Smedley. <http://www.fas.org/man/smedley.htm> (Excerpt of a speech given in 1933.)

²⁹ <http://infohost.nmt.edu/~breynold/pancho.html>. (Pancho Villa Park Information)

Columbus. These were taken east of town, oil was poured over them and they were burned. Almost every house in town had bullet holes in it.”³⁰ It is generally cited that 17 Americans lost their lives in the attack.

Just why Villa made the raid has been a matter generating some speculation and debate. An obvious speculation would be that Wilson was intervening in Mexico on the side of his enemies, so Villa decided to strike back. For instance, one historian claims, “Villa wanted to disrupt relations between Mexico and the United States, cripple (his foe) Carranza, punish the United States, and rally Mexicans to a nationalistic fervor.”³¹ Others contend that Villa had business dealings gone sour, and it was simply a matter of punishing the transgressor. Writing during the 1930s, one source contends, “The Mexicans were searching for Sam Ravel, a merchant of Columbus, with whom, it was reported, Villa had unsatisfactory business dealings.”³²

Whatever the motive, the attack resulted in Wilson sending General John “Black Jack” Pershing across the border to chase down Villa. This

³⁰ <http://southwestcrossroads.org/record.php?num=935> (From a 1930s piece for a WPA project for writers intended to collect information about history and culture.)

³¹ Howell, Jeff. “Pancho Villa, Outlaw, Hero, Patriot, Cutthroat: Evaluating the Many Faces of.” <http://historicaltextarchive.com/sections.php?op=viewarticle&artid=735>. (Howell is restating Frederick Katz’s view. Katz is the author of *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*.)

³² <http://southwestcrossroads.org/record.php?num=935> (From a 1930s piece for a WPA project for writers intended to collect information about history and culture.)

move proved unpopular even with Villa's foes. In fact, President Carranza considered the invasion "a violation of the sovereignty of Mexico" and sent a formal letter of complaint to the United States Government.³³ And yet the search was in vain. Pershing never found Villa, despite bringing an expeditionary force of thousands across the border. According to Sydney Lens, "Pershing chased Villa 300 miles into Mexico – without success and at an eventual cost of \$130 million."³⁴

By 1917, though the situation with Mexico could hardly be viewed as settled, the United States, despite strong opposition from large numbers of US citizens, was poised to enter the war that Wilson promised to stay out of. Along with this war came an attack on the Bill of Rights. It became illegal to speak out against the war, despite the fact that many in Congress opposed and voted against the war. Jeanette Rankin, first female congressperson, who came from Montana, was the only person to vote against both World Wars.

³³ Official Letter of Complaint to the United States Government by President Carranza Regarding Military Operations in Mexico.

<http://www.theomahaproject.org/resources.php?subcategory=International+Affairs&category=20th+Century>

³⁴ Lens, Sydney. *The Forging of the American Empire*. Pluto Press. London; 2003. (pg. 233.)

Eugene Debbs was arrested and imprisoned for speaking against the war.